



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

AMERICA'S DUTY IN THE PHILIPPINES.*

THE American spirit was perhaps never more impressively manifested than in the declaration with which this nation went to war with Spain—not the control of Cuba, but the emancipation of Cuba was solemnly stated as our aim. And after the triumphant close of the war, after the victories in Manila Bay as well as elsewhere, the same spirit found eloquent expression on the lips of the Chief Magistrate of the nation. "The splendid victories we have achieved," he said, (and he said it here in Chicago), "would be our eternal shame and not our everlasting glory, if they led to the weakening of our original lofty purpose or to the desertion of the immortal principles on which the national government is founded. . . . The war with Spain was undertaken not that the United States should increase its territory, but that oppression at our very doors should be stopped. This noble sentiment must continue to animate us, and we must give to the world the full demonstration of the sincerity of our purpose." The American spirit, in and of itself, is neither for nor against expansion—unlimited expansion, so it does not sin against liberty, is consistent with it; it is only against expansion when accomplished by force—our late President tersely expressed it when he spoke of "forcible annexation" as "criminal aggression." This is the fixed star by which the nation must guide its action.

The question that is now before the nation and has been for more than three years is whether the "noble sentiment" with which it took up the cause of Cuba, shall "continue to animate us." If when we took Spain's title to the Philippine Islands by the Treaty of Paris, we had declared that while we had the title, we had no wish to enforce it against the consent of the Filipino people, and that when they succeeded in establishing a government capable of fulfilling governmental functions we should turn over our title to them if they so desired, there would have been no trouble in the Islands. The process of establishing such a government might have taken longer than a

*An address before the Society for Ethical Culture of Chicago.

similar process is taking in Cuba—much longer; but however long and however difficult the process might be, no haunting fear would be disturbing the minds of the Filipinos that we might interfere and attempt to permanently rule them ourselves; they would know that the difficulties were on their side not on ours.

It would have been a noble occupation—this nursing a growing state, this encouraging the self-help of a people. America would have raised our estimate of human nature, our estimate of the possibilities of human government in so doing; it would have set a novel example to old Europe; it would have become not merely America enlightening, but America enfranchising the world. Nor is such a thing an Utopian dream. We actually set out to do this in Cuba, and I believe we are going to do it. To my mind, barring the abatements that we must make in speaking of all human and particularly governmental achievements, our relations to Cuba are one of the brightest and most beautiful pages in history. Why could we not have done or be doing the same thing in the Philippines? Alas! we forgot ourselves. Let us not say it was our late President's fault. Probably nothing contributed so much to an outbreak of hostilities as his cablegram of December 21, 1898, proclaiming United States sovereignty, uncoupled with any declaration that the United States would pay respect to the wishes of the people. But it must be remembered that he had no right to make a declaration of this kind*—that was for Congress to do, if it was to be done. Nor can we impute all the blame to Congress; for did not Congress represent the country, and who can say that the country was in the same mood of magnanimity then that it had been eight months previous, when it approved the declaration to Cuba? It was really people like you and me that were at fault: our high principles were momentarily lost to sight, we thought possibly that we had now a prize that we had better keep, and which no pledge like that to Cuba prevented us from keeping, for new markets, for new investments; many of us imagined, too, that the Filipinos were a lot of sav-

*I waive the question whether he had the right to proclaim sovereignty at all, before a ratification of the Treaty by Congress.

ages, or at best a medley of warring tribes, incapable of united action and self-government—so that for their good as well as our own it would be better to keep control over them. And so we were confused, undecided, at cross purposes with ourselves; we consented to only assertion of sovereignty over the Filipinos, and what we should do with them, or whether we should have any respect to their wishes, we reserved to the future to determine.

In a situation like this, the instincts and aspirations of the Filipinos being what they have proved to be, trouble was bound to come. One clear reassuring word from the President, or from Congress, coupled with whatever assertions of temporary sovereignty, would have allayed their suspicions; but the absence of such a word, joined to an absolute ignoring of the efforts at self-government which the Filipinos were already making, and a half-contemptuous slighting of their army, which had made common cause with our forces against Spain, could only be interpreted by the Filipinos as meaning that whatever their fate was to be, they were to have no hand in shaping it. They took to arms, then, as any self-respecting men would. War was inevitable, they being what they were, and the circumstances being what they were. It matters little who fired the first shot; as it happened, a sentinel of our forces did, but that was an accident.

We have lost a great opportunity and have brought upon ourselves as well as upon the Filipinos untold disaster. It is high time that we came at last to our mind.

We cannot, alas! undo what is done, we cannot raise the thousands dead, who have fought on the one side to defend their liberties and on the other as loyal soldiers of the United States; but the long future is before us, and we can do our best to set ourselves right henceforth. There was a pitiful remark by a member of the House of Representatives not long ago when a number of Philippine bills were up for consideration; he said, what perhaps many more felt, that the question was not whether this bill should pass or that one, but what are we trying to do? The nation is now like a brave, stout vessel at sea, ready to fight any storms that may assail it, but without a chart, without a course marked out, without even a port to sail

to. We have been making good our title in the Islands, we conquered Spain and now we are conquering the Filipinos—but what our object is in all this, what the goal is we are aiming at, whether to make the Islands a colony, or a United States territory and possibly future state or states, or whether we are to concede to the Filipinos an independent national existence, if they desire it, we have not decided and we do not know.

As a possible help to clearness, let us first realize the present situation—what the war has brought us to. Second, let us with the help of such knowledge as has been gathered and is now accessible to us in reliable documents, get a clearer idea of who and what the Filipinos are. Then in conclusion, we may draw our inferences, in the light of facts as well as of principles, as to what the nation ought to do.

The war, or “insurrection,” as we are pleased to term it, has lasted for three years—this though Governor Taft had said that within sixty days after the defeat of Bryan the “last vestige of insurrection” would disappear. The larger part of the Islands has been subjugated—“pacified” is the official word. However, in January President Schurman admitted that fighting was still going on in territory inhabited by about a quarter to a fifth of the population*—and there has been no noticeable change since, though the rigor of the “concentration” camps will undoubtedly make a change. How superficial the pacification may sometimes be is shown in the fact that some islands that had been turned over from military to civil rule have been turned back to military rule again. Forty-two per cent. of the territory or thirty per cent. of the population are still under military rule—or were in November (as reported by Secretary Root). Every now and then we hear of instances of those who had been supposed to be submissive and loyal, showing their hostility when an occasion arose; secretly they furnish ammunition to the insurgents or they openly take arms again. General Chaffee is reported to have said indeed that the natives are all traitors to American sovereignty, have their hearts set on independence.† Senator Bacon, who was in the Philippines last summer and mingled much with the army, says‡ that “with

*“Philippine Affairs, a Retrospect and Outlook,” p. 55. †*Ibid.*, p. 106.

‡*Army and Navy Journal*, February 8, 1902.

scarcely an exception the opinion was expressed by them [army officers] that at heart the Filipinos are unfriendly to Americans, that they are intensely hostile to American rule, that where they profess loyalty to our government it is feigned and insincere, and that where hostilities have ceased it is because the natives have, of necessity, laid down their arms in submission to the power which they could not resist."

The methods we are now coming to use to subdue or "pacify" the Filipinos are extreme. I do not refer now to ordinary acts of cruelty such as are apt to accompany all war—or even to the "water cure," an exquisite mode of torture which Governor Taft describes as consisting of pouring water down the throats of men until they swell up and, becoming frightened, tell what they know: for instance, where guns are hidden. I am glad to believe that these are isolated acts and against orders. What I refer to is extreme measures taken by military orders—I mean the so-called "concentration camps." It may be described as a method of winning submission by starvation. Zones are established around our garrisons within which all inhabitants of the country round about must gather themselves. Any outside are liable to be shot or hanged. No neutrality is permitted. Every inhabitant must be either an active friend or treated as an enemy. Those inside must take the oath of allegiance to the United States, and they must prove their sincerity by going out and locating insurgent rifles and supplies—if they have been insurgents, they must be ready to publicly participate in operations against their former leaders: as the *Manila American* patriotically puts it, "they must prove their good intentions by good deeds." As a result, fires are seen in every direction around the camps, villages, farms and growing crops are destroyed; and inside we are manufacturing informers, spies, hypocrites, or loyal Americans—it does not matter much by which term we describe them. It is a method we appear to have learned from old Spain. We are humaner, no doubt, and take better sanitary precautions; but in principle the camps are the same as those of Weyler in Cuba. We have actually army officers saying now that "Weyler knew his business." We are not even up to Aguinaldo's standard, who in his first proclamation in 1898 forbade the maltreating of

neutrals and made it a criminal offence to do so. One of our late President's demands on Spain in 1898 was "the immediate revocation of the order of reconcentration" in Cuba, and now we are officially issuing orders of reconcentration ourselves! This is one of the things the war is leading us to.

Another extraordinary official measure is our treason and sedition laws. Do we realize that it is now a crime in the Philippines to advocate the independence of the Islands, even if the means urged for reaching such an end are peaceable—that free speech and a free press are virtually annihilated there, that if anyone should speak or write there as I am doing here to-day, he would be liable to fine and imprisonment? Yet these are the provisions of Section 10 of Act No. 292 of the United States Philippine Commission.* President Schurman, a member of the first Philippine Commission, and a man of weight, urged eventual independence as a solution of the Philippine problem in a notable speech in Boston in January—a speech that has been printed† and should be read by every thoughtful citizen—and straightway the cable announced that one of our Philippine commanders, General Wheaton, said that men had been sent to prison in Manila for such remarks as those. This is the condition of affairs. It has its effect even here at home. But the other day Governor Taft was asked before our Senate Committee whether a recent speech of Senator Hoar's would not, if circulated in the Philippines, subject the author to arrest; and the chairman of the committee rushed in to check such a line of investigation, and Governor Taft begged to be excused from answering. In Chicago this past week one of our generals, who captured Aguinaldo by a

*The following is the text: "Until it has been officially proclaimed that a state of war or insurrection against the authority of sovereignty of the United States no longer exists in the Philippine islands, it shall be unlawful for any person to advocate, orally or by writing, or printing, or like methods, the independence of the Philippine islands or their separation from the United States, whether by peaceable or forcible means, or to print, publish, or circulate any handbill, newspaper, or other publication, advocating such independence or separation.

"Any person violating the provisions of this section shall be punished by a fine of not exceeding \$2,000, and imprisonment not exceeding one year."

†"Philippine Affairs," already cited.

trick, was commenting on two negro deserters to the Filipinos, who were caught and hanged, and said, "it would have been more an act of justice had we hanged some of the people who signed the recent petition to Congress asking that we confer with the Filipino leaders in an effort to secure peace." Terror in the Philippines and terror at home would seem to be the policy of this brave little general. What demoralization when such rubbish is listened to without a protest by a company of representative Chicago men! The general made much of Filipino assassinations—bad and vicious enough, surely. But how about the assassination of liberty? How about putting the gags on a Senator Hoar, or a President Schurman—yes, on the sacred shade of an Abraham Lincoln, who said, "Those who deny freedom to others deserve it not for themselves," and who being dead yet speaks to us?

Yes, to a still graver consequence is the war leading some of us. There can be little question, if this war has been right, the Declaration of Independence is wrong. And some of us are following the inexorable logic. We are lapsing into the tone taken in the old slavery days when the principles of that immortal document were called "glittering generalities." There is a fresh outbreak of the old, pagan, barbaric doctrine that might makes right—a doctrine that all civilization is a protest against. Even college professors are losing the fine edge of their moral sense. Professor Hart, of Harvard, urges, in so many words, in his recent "Foundations of American Foreign Policy," that we must give up our contempt for other nations which rule with an iron hand and must abandon the principle that all just government depends on the consent of the governed. This degradation of our ideals is the saddest, the most mortal injury that the war is inflicting upon us. In frank harmony was the question addressed to one of our Congressmen, who was in Manila last summer, by an army officer there with reference to the translations of the Declaration of Independence as well as of the Constitution that had been circulated under General MacArthur—"What do you think of circulating that d—— incendiary document, sir?" he was asked.* I see no reason for blinking the fact—no way of

*The *Nation*, January 23, 1902, p. 60.

evading the force of the blunt soldier's question; the document is an "incendiary" one over there; it stirs up the very spirits that we wish to down and suppress; it is a piece of folly from the military standpoint to circulate it. But what a pass the war is bringing us to, when it is raising the question whether we ought not to hide and conceal an enunciation of the principles on which this nation's life was built!

These are some of the things that the war is leading us to—if for no other reason, is it not well to reflect a moment and ask if the war was really necessary?

Who and what are the Filipinos, for whose subjection we have been resorting to such measures, and incurring such grave risks? Unquestionably information has been gained in the last few years that we did not have at first. If any of us had been asked four years ago who were the inhabitants of the Philippine Islands, we should probably have answered, if we could have said anything at all, that they were a lot of savages. Only ethnologists and travelers knew. The popular impression lasted long. And it was made good use of. It was proclaimed on a thousand stumps during the campaign of 1900, by men who might have been supposed to know, that Aguinaldo was a savage like Sitting Bull and that the population of Luzon and the Visayans were to be compared to the Comanches and painted Sioux. More recently a United States Senator has placed them intellectually on a level with caribou bulls. And yet if we had been intent on the matter we might have learned differently very soon. General Anderson wrote in July, 1898, "We have heretofore underrated the natives. They are not ignorant, savage tribes, but have a civilization of their own." The information won by scholars before and since has been made accessible to us in a special chapter of the report of the United States Bureau of Education for 1901.* The real savages on the Philippine Islands comparable to our Indians

*See extracts in the *Philippine Review* (The Philippine Information Society, 62 Wall street, New York; 12 Otis place, Boston.), December, 1901. Students of the subject are greatly indebted to the painstaking and thoroughly unpartizan work of the Philippine Information Society, the results of which are embodied in the *Philippine Review*, and in an earlier series of pamphlets, entitled "Facts About the Filipinos."

are a minority—at best not more than a sixth or seventh of the population. With them the United States has practically had little or nothing to do—they living far in the interior of the islands. There are also the Mohammedan Malays of the southern islands. They are quite distinct from the Christianized Malays of Luzon and the northern islands, and it is with the latter alone that we have had any trouble. They are the Filipinos proper—the only ones that count or are to be reckoned with in the present situation. Their ancestors were dwellers on the coasts and had even a measure of civilization when the Islands were discovered by the Spaniards. They carried on trade with China and Japan. Philippine vessels were seen in Malacca by the Portuguese on their arrival there in 1511—twenty years before the Spanish Magellan discovered the Islands. The representative men of the Filipinos are educated professional and business men, the best of whom are on a par with the corresponding classes elsewhere in the world. President Schurman says that to have met and known these educated Filipinos, to have had social intercourse and official relations with them, he counts one of the pleasantest and most interesting recollections of his life. The first Philippine Commission testified to the high range of their intelligence, and also to their social refinement, the grace and charm of their personal character. They “are the equals of the men one meets in similar vocations—law, medicine, business, etc.—in Europe or America.” Those who have met Senor Sixto Lopez, who has been in this country, can credit the truth of the statement. Of course, these educated men are in the minority (though as the Commission said, “far more numerous than is generally supposed”); and yet Lieutenant Gillmore, who was a prisoner early in the war and traversed some of the wildest and most mountainous parts of Luzon, says that though wretchedly clothed one could not fairly call the people he saw uncivilized, that in every bamboo hut there was a book or two and that the priests kept school in every village and the native children were compelled to attend.* It is true that this Filipino civilization, as

*See Lieutenant Gillmore's account of his experiences, in *McClure's Magazine*, August and September, 1900.

the same witness says, was, like that of all people under Spanish rule, a couple of centuries behind the time—it was thought enough for girls, for instance, if they learned to read the catechism and the prayer book; and yet it is surprising to hear that the ability to read was more general than in many of the provinces of Spain,*—that ten per cent. of the six hundred Filipino teachers who attended the preliminary term of the Manila Normal School, established by the United States, could already speak English quite well, and the majority of the remainder could understand the elementary instruction when given in English;† that there was a university at Manila with 1681 students in 1895-1896; that there were nine other secondary colleges throughout the archipelago, with an attendance that same year of 8070, besides sixty-seven private Latin schools, and a school of agriculture, a nautical school, a superior school of painting, sculpture and engraving, and a military academy; that the number of primary schools in the Islands was 2167, there being two schools for each sex in every town of 5000 inhabitants, three for each sex in towns of 10,000 inhabitants, and so on.‡ All this hardly looks like a stage of culture such as that of the “painted Sioux.” The ridiculousness of such a notion is palpable also when we become aware that in the civil tribunals that Governor Taft’s Commission is setting up in the Islands there are always some Filipinos. For example in the justice’s court in each of the 765 municipalities that have been organized, the justice is a Filipino; in the larger district courts six out of the sixteen judges are Filipinos, and there are three Filipinos in the Supreme Court—one of them, to quote President Schurman’s language, “the wise, high-minded and capable Florentino Torres, and another, the Chief Justice, that model Filipino, Cayelario S. Arellano, a man of spotless integrity, a lawyer of great eminence and renown, and a gentleman of learning, culture, and the most charming refinement of life and manners.”§ If these men, like that other

*C. B. S., in *Outlook*, September 7, 1901.

†F. W. Nash, in *Educational Review*, October, 1901.

‡“Report of Commissioner of Education” (for 1901), ch. xxix., summarized in *Philippine Review*, December, 1901.

§“Philippine Affairs,” p. 6.

leader of the people, Aguinaldo, are more properly to be compared to Sitting Bull, our Commission surely has misplaced them.

Another fact. Though the relatively ignorant are the large majority, and the educated a small minority in the country, the majority take the minority as their natural leaders. By universal testimony they are not an anarchic, willful, but a docile people—the popular tendency, says Schurman,* is to admire and almost worship their educated men, and Governor Taft remarks† that they are, if anything, too easily controlled by the educated among them. In this fact lies the possibility of political coherency for the people.

Still further. Our first Philippine Commission reported that the idea of independence arose for the first time in the summer of 1898. We now know that this was a mistake. Recently the constitution drawn up during the uprising against Spain in '96 and '97 has been discovered, and that document declares for a separation from the kingdom of Spain in order to establish an independent state. In fact there has been a semi-national, or at least a strong racial consciousness, on the part of the Filipinos for some time. It appears in such circumstances as Governor Taft speaks of when he refers (before the Senate Committee) to their "pride of country"—they have a "greater attachment" for their country, he says, than the Chinese have for theirs. It appears, too, in such a fact as that, through three long centuries of Spanish rule, the people have tenaciously preserved their own language or dialects—not five per cent. of them speaking or understanding Spanish. This is somewhat extraordinary in view of the contrary fact that Spanish became the universal language of Spanish South America and Mexico. There was some vital, sturdy consciousness of its own particular self, that could make a people thus hold its own. Somehow, too, Spanish oppression seems to have more or less united and cemented them. There have been many insurrections—in 1622, in 1629, in 1649, in 1827, in 1844, in 1872; these and particularly the last and more general one of '96 and '97, with its illustrious martyr Rizal, con-

*P. 48.

†*Philippine Review*, February, 1902, p. 142.

tributed to intensify the national feeling. In any case the extent of the sway of the government improvised under the leadership of Aguinaldo in the summer of 1898 was something remarkable. It was recognized practically throughout Luzon. The prisoners whom I have already quoted found orderly, peaceful communities far in the interior, with the educated and wealthy class prominent in the control of affairs, and enthusiastically supporting in most instances the insurgent government. The Visayan islands, too, coöperated, and practically all the islands of the archipelago save those in which the Mohammedan world had control. The Tagals of Luzon were the leaders, but our special Commissioner of Education says in his report that they are "the natural leaders of the islands," being the foremost in energy and intellect, and the sense of a common interest and danger seems to have temporarily drowned the suspicions and enmities of the inhabitants of other islands.

We alas! took no account of these things at the time, and the most charitable view is that most of us did not know of them. We knew only of the sovereignty that we had inherited from Spain, which we proceeded to enforce as energetically as ever Spain had hers. The fact is that the Spanish dominion was in the first place for the most part peacefully secured—the Filipinos having first been Christianized by Spanish Catholic missionaries and then willingly becoming the subjects of the King of Spain, a step which they seem to have regarded almost as a consequence of baptism. But America unhappily fell into war from the start—and now, marvelous to relate, our very efforts to subdue a rebellious people have made them more a people than ever. Dr. Schurman says, "The Filipinos have condensed the experience of centuries into these last half-dozen years."* He speaks of the emergence, during this period of storm and stress, of a community of attitude, interest, sentiment, and aspiration, that was undiscoverable or at least undiscerned [a wise qualification] before. They have, he says, dreamed of liberty and they have fought for it, and so real has become the consciousness of nationality, that he credits the reported dictum of General Chaffee that they are all traitors to

*P. 88.

American sovereignty and have their hearts set on independence.* It is sometimes said that it is only the poorer, the more ignorant classes that are against us—those that have nothing to lose; but that the men of property and education are with us. But this is an illusion. There are of course wealthy and educated people, who have accepted American sovereignty, but they are a small party and an unpopular party and at present a stationary party†—they are known as Federalists, and are mostly in Manila. But the mass of the people, of all classes, are against American sovereignty—however for reasons of policy they may appear to submit to it. Sometimes it is the wealthy classes that are singled out for special reprobation by our authorities. In the concentration orders one reads a passage like this, which throws a flood of light on the real situation: “The wealthy and influential and town and insurgent officials are therefore those against whom our most energetic efforts should be directed. The common people amount to nothing. They are merely densely ignorant tools who blindly follow the lead of the principles.”‡ It is evident to anyone who will use his eyes that we are face to face not with a hostile faction but with a hostile people. The war has been all over the islands, said recently Governor Taft. General MacArthur reported in 1900 that there was substantial unity among the Filipino people in their opposition to the United States. Even now that they are beaten (or being beaten), there appears to be no less opposition.

It is this sense of nascent nationality that is the commanding fact in the present situation. A people that does not aspire to be a people may have no right to be one, but a people that does so aspire has the right. To deny such a right, to choke such aspirations is a kind of political murder. It is as if you should strangle an unborn child. Schurman says that Gladstone—venerable name—said that struggling nationalities are the jewels of history, the hope and promise of the world.

But, it is said, the Filipinos are incapable of self-government.

*“Philippine Affairs,” p. 106.

†See *Philippine Review*, March, 1902, p. 179ff.

‡Order of General Bell, as given in the *Army and Navy Journal*, January 25, 1902, p. 510.

How do we know this? If they were anarchic, if they recognized no principles of subordination, we might say it. But the essential political virtues (for any people making their first experiment in statehood), loyalty to leaders and obedience, they have. Moreover, they showed political capacity in the government they created at Malolos. They had peaceful municipal and provincial government far more widely throughout the islands than we have to-day. A major in our army, writing in the February *Forum*, says that this government was a strong one, exercising real power while it lasted—that it was distinctly an advance on Spanish rule. Still more, our present Philippine Commission testifies that the native officials that are now at work under our supervision have proved reasonably capable in the administration of affairs.

What, then, I ask, is to hinder us from saying and publishing to the Filipinos, that as soon as they can build up a really effective government, we are ready to surrender our sovereignty to them? But why can we not call an assembly of the people, just as we called an assembly of the Cuban people—or at least prepare to issue such a call, and announce that we shall issue it—and if that assembly is really representative and its work anywise commends itself to us as sound and just, then give over to it the title to self-government which every united and aspiring people ought to have?

I believe that something of this sort is our only ultimatum—the only result with which the great heart of America can be satisfied. To found subject colonies is not American business. The only possible line of aggressive action for us is to keep free and to make free. We may proceed tentatively in the Philippines—we need not withdraw our helping hand at once. We may train the people for a little while, as the Taft Commission is proposing to do and is already in a measure doing. We may coöperate with them, we may give them of our experience, of our ideas of law, of our ideas of education. But we can only do this effectually, we can only get one particle of sympathy from the mass of the people on the proviso that we distinctly state that we wish to do no violence to their sense of nationality, that we wish to respect it, that we view our only

office to be to help it to come to a triumphant and glorious birth. Then we shall become friends to the Philippine people; then we shall be not a master, but an elder brother to them—then they will as willingly take the hand of friendship as they hated the hand of force. In vain is all we are doing for them till we do this. In vain are our schools or our roads or our civil justices, without liberty, or at least the promise of the same. They will take these things, but they will not thank us for them—for they know that till we grant them liberty, we do not respect them, much less do we love them.

From recent events my hopes run high that the nation will yet take this magnanimous course. I believe that many have consented to the nation's silence and indecision through ignorance of the situation and that the light will spread. I cannot think that the heart and conscience of our people have any sympathy with violence to the principles of the Declaration of Independence. They will right themselves on this point, give them time. I take confidence in the soberer tone that is coming over our high officials—instead of "gems and glories of the tropic seas" we now hear that we have "a great burden." The Taft Commission itself says that "what the Filipino people desire is a definite knowledge of the intention of Congress with respect" to them. President Schurman urges granting to the Filipinos representative institutions at once. He thinks that the day of their safe and rightful liberation may be near—nearer than he believed possible three years ago. Secretary Long has made a notable utterance. While putting the time further off than President Schurman, he said, when the time comes that our trust is executed and the ability of self-government is assured, then the question of their political status will be for the people of those islands themselves to decide. "Whether they will walk alone and independent or whether they will walk hand in hand with us, as Canada walks with England, they—whoever they shall be—will decide. And as England respects the wishes of Canada in this regard, so shall we then respect, and ought to respect, the wishes of the Philippines." Even our Chief Magistrate has used language which on the face of it means only one thing. "We hope," he said in

his message to Congress of last December, "to do for them [the Filipinos] what has never before been done for any people of the tropics—to make them fit for self-government after the fashion of the really free nations." Why shall not Congress have the large mindedness, the supreme political wisdom, to draft these views into a definite statute? Why shall not the "noble sentiment" that found expression in its memorable declaration with regard to labor assert itself once more? When this happens, the war will stop in a day. When this happens, it is even possible that something of the old Filipino feeling may come back that had touching expression on one of those glorious July days in 1898—for when the insurgent leaders in Cavite invited a number of our army and navy officers to a banquet and in the after-dinner speaking the Filipinos said they wished to be annexed, but not conquered, and one of our officers in reply assured them that we had not come to make them slaves, but to make them free men, a singular scene followed: All the Filipinos rose to their feet, and one of them, taking his wine-glass in his hand, said: "We wish to be baptized in that sentiment." And he and the rest poured the wine from their glasses over their heads. Possibly, I say, a touch of this joy and exultation might come again—however deep and black the shadows of the last three years. Why shall not Congress act, I repeat, and put an end to the miserable indecision in which the nation stands? Yet the leaders of our leaders are the common people of the land. The question I raise, great as it is, is primarily your question and mine. Ponder it, I ask you, as a matter of personal duty. Clear up your mind as to what you think is right, and then stand for it steadily, unflinchingly, in public and in private; join with others who think like you, until your insight and will are written into the law of the land. Till the majority of the people are right, the country inevitably goes wrong.

WILLIAM M. SALTER.

CHICAGO.